

### AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The office action indicated that Figures 1 and 2 were objected to because of borderlines. Four replacement sheets of formal drawings, compliant with 37 CFR 1.121(d), are attached to replace the four sheets of informal drawings submitted with the application. The replacement sheets contain no borderlines. No new matter has been added in the replacement drawings.

Attachments: 4 Replacement Sheets

### REMARKS

Claims 1- 26 are pending in the instant patent application. The Abstract and Claims 1, 6, 8, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22 have been amended. Four formal replacement drawings are attached to replace the four sheets of informal drawings filed with the application. No new matter has been added in the abstract, drawings, or claims.

### SPECIFICATION

Portions of the abstract were objected to. A revised abstract appears above. Applicants respectfully submit that the revisions to the abstract put it into the proper format to overcome the objection.

### DRAWINGS

#### 37 CFR 1.21(d)

The office action indicated that the drawings were objected to and requested replacement drawings.

Applicants respectfully submit four sheets of formal replacement drawings to replace the four sheets of informal drawings filed with the application. As noted above, the new drawing sheets are attached.

### CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 6, 13, and 20 were objected to as being unclear. The rejection recommended amending claims 6, 13, and 20 to recite "... schedule for initiating said receiving of said second hardware configuration." The Applicants have amended Claims 6, 13, and 20 as recommended.

Claims 15 – 21 were objected to as being unclear. The rejection recommended replacing the term “A computer-useable medium” in Claims 15 – 21 with “A computer-readable medium,” on line 1 of each claim. The Applicants have amended Claims 15 - 21 as recommended.

### CLAIM REJECTIONS

#### 35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 1, 5, 8, 12, 15, 19, 22, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Matthews, Jr. et al U.S. Patent No. 6,457,125 (hereinafter Matthews). The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 5, 8, 12, 15, 19, 22, and 26 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Matthews.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 1, which recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to a method for updating a hardware configuration of a networked communications device comprising:

storing a first hardware configuration of said networked communications device having an associated checksum and an associated timestamp indicating when said first hardware configuration was received;

receiving a second hardware configuration over a network, wherein said second hardware configuration is received into a memory of said networked communications device;

performing a checksum operation on said second hardware configuration to verify a received copy of said second hardware configuration;

creating a timestamp associated with said second hardware configuration to indicate when said second hardware configuration was received; and

programming a programmable logic unit on said networked communications device according to said second hardware configuration, wherein said programming occurs in conjunction with a boot process initiation if said second hardware configuration has a correct checksum and a more recent associated timestamp than said first hardware configuration.

Independent Claims 8, 15, and 22 contain similar limitations and were rejected with the same rationale. Claim 5 depends from independent Claim 1 and recites further limitations to the claimed invention. Claim 12 depends from independent Claim 8 and recites further limitations to the claimed invention. Claim 19 depends from independent Claim 15 and recites further limitations to the claimed invention. Claim 26 depends from independent Claim 22 and recites further limitations to the claimed invention.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Matthews does not teach or suggest a method for updating a hardware configuration of a networked communications device that includes, “performing a checksum operation on said second hardware configuration to verify a received copy of said second hardware configuration; creating a timestamp associated with said second hardware configuration to indicate when said second hardware configuration was received; and programming a programmable logic unit on said networked communications device according to said second hardware configuration, wherein said programming occurs in conjunction with a boot process initiation if said second hardware configuration has a correct checksum and a more recent associated timestamp than said first hardware configuration,” as recited in Applicants’ Claim 1. Matthews discloses that a configuration can be downloaded, and stored (see e.g., col. 1 lines 44 – 50), but Matthews does not deal with any specific mechanism for determining which downloaded configuration to program into a Programmable Logic Device (PLD).

The Matthews reference is primarily concerned with encryption of configuration information (see e.g., col. 2 lines 28 – 63). Contrarily, the Applicants’ invention as set forth in Claim 1 is concerned with programming a PLD in conjunction with a boot process initiation when a second hardware configuration has a correct checksum and a more recent associated

timestamp than said first hardware configuration. Matthews, by contrast, is silent, and does not teach or suggest utilizing a checksum or a timestamp to determine if a second hardware configuration should be programmed into a programmable logic device in conjunction with a boot process initiation. Consequently, the Matthews reference does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the Applicants' invention as are recited in Claims 1, 8, 15, and 22.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Matthews does not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 1, 8, 15, and 22, and as such, Claims 1, 8, 15, and 22 overcome the basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 and are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants also respectfully submit that Matthews does not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as is recited in Claim 5 dependent on Claim 1, Claim 12 dependent on Claim 8, Claim 19 dependent on Claim 15, and Claim 26 dependent on Claim 22, and as such Claims 5, 12, 19, and 26 overcome the Examiner's basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C.102 through dependence on allowable base claims, and are therefore in condition for allowance.

#### 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 2 - 4, 9 - 11, 16 - 18, and 23 - 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews as applied to Claims 1, 8, 15, and 22, in view of Collins U.S. Patent No. 5,671,355. Applicants have reviewed the cited references, and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 2 - 4, 9 - 11, 16- 18, and 23 - 25 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Matthews or Collins, either alone or in combination.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 1, shown above. Claims 8, 15, and 22 contain similar limitations and were rejected with the same rationale. Claims 2 – 5 depend from independent Claim 1 and recite further limitations to the claimed invention. Claims 9 – 11 depend from independent Claim 8 and recite further limitations to the claimed invention. Claims 16 – 18 depend from independent Claim 15 and recite further limitations to the claimed invention. Claims 23 – 25 depend from independent Claim 22 and recite further limitations to the claimed invention.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Collins does not cure the deficiencies of Matthews noted above with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 102 rejection of Claim 1. Instead, Collins, like Matthews above, does not teach or suggest a method for updating a hardware configuration of a networked communications device that includes, “performing a checksum operation on said second hardware configuration to verify a received copy of said second hardware configuration; creating a timestamp associated with said second hardware configuration to indicate when said second hardware configuration was received; and programming a programmable logic unit on said networked communications device according to said second hardware configuration, wherein said programming occurs in conjunction with a boot process initiation if said second hardware configuration has a correct checksum and a more recent associated timestamp than said first hardware configuration,” as recited in Applicants’ Claim 1. In fact, the entire Collins reference is silent with respect to utilizing a checksum or a timestamp to determine if a second hardware configuration should be programmed into a programmable logic device in conjunction with a boot process initiation. Consequently, the combination of Matthews and Collins does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the Applicants’ invention as are recited in Claims 1, 8, 15, and 22.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Matthews nor Collins, either alone or in combination, anticipates or renders obvious the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 1, 8, 15, and 22, and as such, Claims 1, 8, 15, and 22 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 and are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants also respectfully submit that the combination of Matthews and Collins does not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as is recited in Claims 2 – 4 dependent on Claim 1, Claims 9 – 11 dependent on Claim 8, Claims 16 -18 dependent on Claim 15, and Claims 23 - 25 dependent on Claim 22, and as such Claims 2 - 4, 9 - 11, 16 - 18, and 23 - 25 overcome the Examiner's basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C.103 through dependence on allowable base claims, and are therefore in condition for allowance.

Claims 6, 7, 13, 14, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matthews as applied to Claims 1, 8, and 15, in view of Fletcher et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,009,274 (hereinafter Fletcher). Applicants have reviewed the cited references, and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 6, 7, 13, 14, 20, and 21 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Matthews or Fletcher, either alone or in combination.

The Examiner is respectfully directed to independent Claim 1, shown above. Claims 8, 15, and 22 contain similar limitations and were rejected with the same rationale. Claims 6 and 7 depend from independent Claim 1 and recite further limitations to the claimed invention. Claims 13 and 14 depend from independent Claim 8 and recite further limitations to the claimed

invention. Claims 20 and 21 depend from independent Claim 15 and recite further limitations to the claimed invention.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Fletcher does not cure the deficiencies of Matthews, noted above with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 102 rejection of Claim 1. Instead, Fletcher, like Matthews above, does not teach or suggest a method for updating a hardware configuration of a networked communications device that includes, “performing a checksum operation on said second hardware configuration to verify a received copy of said second hardware configuration; creating a timestamp associated with said second hardware configuration to indicate when said second hardware configuration was received; and programming a programmable logic unit on said networked communications device according to said second hardware configuration, wherein said programming occurs in conjunction with a boot process initiation if said second hardware configuration has a correct checksum and a more recent associated timestamp than said first hardware configuration,” as recited in Applicants’ Claim 1. In fact, the entire Fletcher reference is silent with respect to utilizing a checksum or a timestamp to determine if a second hardware configuration should be programmed into a programmable logic device in conjunction with a boot process initiation. Consequently, the combination of Matthews and Fletcher does not anticipate or render obvious the embodiments of the Applicants’ invention as are recited in Claims 1, 8, and 15.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Matthews nor Fletcher, either alone or in combination, anticipates or renders obvious the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 1, 8, and 15, and as such, Claims 1, 8, and 15 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 and are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants also respectfully submit that



the combination of Matthews and Fletcher does not anticipate or render obvious the present claimed invention as is recited in Claims 6 and 7 dependent on Claim 1, Claims 13 and 14 dependent on Claim 8, and Claims 20 and 21 dependent on Claim 15, and as such Claims 6, 7, 13, 14, 20, and 21 overcome the Examiner's basis for rejection under 35 U.S.C.103 through dependence on allowable base claims, and are therefore in condition for allowance.


### SUMMARY

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims in the instant patent application are in condition for allowance. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the Application and allowance of the pending claims.

If the Examiner determines the prompt allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' designated representative at the below listed phone number.

Respectfully submitted,  
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: 19 July, 2005

  
Jeffrey B. Morris  
Registration No. 55,466

Address: WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP  
Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, California 95113  
Telephone: (408) 938-9060 Voice  
(408) 938-9069 Facsimile

Serial No.: 10/071,811  
Examiner: Michael Meucci

- 19 -

Art Unit: 2142  
CSCO-69301